

CI 1998 J Pluis

First name: Jason

Last name: Pluis

Q1:

improve key elements of existing framework

Q2:

consistency across media types

Q3:

If the content is publicly viewable (ie Mr Joe Public does not get a choice about seeing the content, such as billboards, shop displays, etc) then it should meet some criteria that enable it to be judged as fit for public consumption.

If the content is for private consumption it would be good to have some indication of the nature of the content before one views the content.

Q4:

Not necessarily - if the content's purpose is for wide-spread dissemination then it should be classified to a level that allows the consumer to estimate its appropriateness for purchase or viewing. If the viewer feels that it has been inappropriately classified mechanisms should exist for complaints to be handled that may result in more appropriate classification of the content

Q5:

classification of materials allows me as an individual (and a parent) to make appropriate decisions about what I (and my children) view. Understandable what I feel is appropriate for my children differs from other parents. I expect that books, movies, computer games and music to be classified to a particular degree so I can make a judgement call as to the appropriateness of the content. Anything other than those types of content I believe it is MY job to investigate the content before giving it to my children for viewing.

Q6:

No. Self-classification should be sufficient if one allows for a complaints system. I like the way it works for TV programs in that not only is the classification displayed, but the components that led to the classification (e.g. [minor/major] drug use, [mild/severe] violence, swearing, etc.)

Q7:

Perhaps. Let them first self-classify, and only bring involve a complaints system if warranted

Q8:

Yes

Q9:

No

Q10:

No.

Q11:

~

Q12:

You cannot restrict online content. The current URL filter implemented by Telstra and Optus can be worked around by using alternative DNS providers. Content filters can be worked around by using VPN's. Content is extremely mutable. You can't block it quick enough to stop access. If the content is indeed abhorrent enough go through other legal channels (eg Australian Federal Police) to get the content removed and the people responsible for creating the content charged)

Q13:

In order of effectiveness and difficulty to work around:

1. Parental supervision.
2. Opt-in content blocking either installed at home or provided by ISP).
3. Government mandated secret list of blocked sites.

Q14:

It's fine now. Plastic wrap and/or shop supervision is ok.

Q15:

When it is to the advantage of the consumer. Books, movies, music, computer games are the big ticket items.

Q16:

Users - consumers of classification advice. Able to raise complaints to industry bodies

Industry Bodies - Provision advice on self-classification to industry members. First port of call for complaints.

Govt Agencies - Final port of call for complaints. Able to get assistance from enforcement agencies.

Q17:

Yes.

Q18:

books, movies, music and computer games.

Q19:

None. The classification system should be simple enough for content producers to get right 999 times out of a thousand.

Q20:

For tv and movies the existing classification categories understood in the community. I find it bizarre that computer games do not have "R18+ Restricted" category.

Q21:

I think the standard G, PG, M, MA, R and X are pretty good. Especially combined with indicators (sex, violence, drug use etc). I am dumbfounded by the lack of higher rated categories in computer games. It makes sense to have the classification system standardised across Australia. If different states want to implement different rules regarding the sale, distribution, and viewing of content that that is OK.

Q22:

Ensure that for each classification there are proper descriptions of the levels of particular indicators.

Eg. "Depictions of penetrative sex will automatically guarantee a classification of <insert rating>"

Some are obvious, Some are not. Provide examples to industry. Make the guidelines freely available.

Make it the job of the OFLC to keep the guideline up to date with community standards.

Q23:

Yes

Q24:

1. You can't prohibit anything online. You can try but you cannot succeed.
2. I am happy for you to block the child-porn (or any depictions of cruelty that involve one party not having a choice in the matter).
3. Realistically, not many people just "stumble across" child-porn on the internet. I strongly doubt that those that create and distribute child-porn simply host it on unprotected web sites. I would suggest efforts would be better spent tracking down the people that create the content then attempting to block all and sundry.

Q25:

No. A variety of computer games have or would have received RC classification (if the content had not been changed by their creators.) The RC classification system should be consistent across Australia and across content types.

Q26:

1. Consistency of classification systems across state and territory is VERY important.
2. The differences between the laws allowing sale and distribution of content with certain classifications is not as important.

Q27:

don't replace it - just standardise the classification schemes across all content and all states

Q28:

It would be nice to remove the ability for one Attorney General to stymie changes, but if the classification system was standardised I have no problem with individual states having legislation about what cannot be displayed/sold in their home state.

Q29:

Standardisation across content. I am very disappointed that classification of computer games does not include R+ classifications.

Other comments:

~